

REMARKS

Claims 6 and 13 have been canceled. Claims 2-5 and 10-12, and amended claims 1, 7-9, 14, and 15 are in this application.

Claims 1-3, 8-10, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yeo (U.S. Patent No. 2003/0088646).

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part the following:

"a command generator operable to generate an object number select subfunction command which conforms to a 1394 specification and which requests the another information processor to extract and produce a specified video frame of the video stream recorded in the record medium, and to send the video frame after converting it into still image data." (Emphasis added.)

In explaining the above 102 rejection, the Examiner appears to assert that subsystem 308 in figure 3 of Yeo is the same as the "command generator" of claim 1 and, in support thereof, relies on lines 1-7 of paragraph 0020, lines 1-8 of paragraph 0022, lines 8-11 of paragraph 0023, and lines 8-12 of paragraph 0038 of Yeo. (See lines 6-14 of section 2 of the present Office Action.) It is respectfully submitted that such portions of Yeo relied upon by the Examiner do not disclose "a command generator operable to generate an object number select subfunction command which conforms to a 1394 specification and which requests the another information processor to extract and produce a specified video frame of the video stream . . .," as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is distinguishable from Yeo as applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that

amended independent claims 8, 9, and 15 are distinguishable from Yeo as applied by the Examiner.

Claims 2, 3, and 10 are dependent from one of amended independent claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2, 3, and 10 are distinguishable from Yeo as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 4, 5, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeo (U.S. Patent No. 2003/0088646) in view of Nakaya (U.S. Patent No. 5,585,856). Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeo (U.S. Patent No. 2003/0088646) in view of Takeda (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,215).

As previously described, claims 6 and 13 have been canceled. Claims 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, and 14 are dependent from one of amended independent claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, and 14 are distinguishable from Yeo as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner appears to only rely on Nakaya for the features of claims 4, 5, 11, and 12, and appears to only rely on Takeda for the features of claims 7 and 14 and not to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Yeo. Accordingly, claims 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, and 14 are believed to be respectively distinguishable from the applied combination of Yeo and Nakaya and the applied combination of Yeo and Takeda.

Applicant submits that the features added to claims 1, 8, 9, and 15 are fully supported by the specification of the present application and thus, do not add any new matter into this application. For example, support for such features may be found at least at paragraphs 0071, 0082, and 0083 of the present specification.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.


If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 518-6374 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges required in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: September 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By



Dennis M. Smid

Registration No.: 34,930
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorneys for Applicant